



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

See 29 HARV. L. REV. 433. Whether the stipulation in the principal case as to the use of the vote ought to be considered unfair to minority stockholders, so as to invalidate the trust, is not clear on the authorities. See *Cone v. Russell*, 48 N. J. Eq. 208, 21 Atl. 847; *Woodruff v. Wentworth*, 133 Mass. 309. But see *Winsor v. Coal Co.*, 63 Wash. 62, 114 Pac. 908. Trusts subjecting the vote to the dictation of living third parties have been upheld. *Elger v. Boyle*, 69 Misc. 273, 126 N. Y. Supp. 946; *Lafferty's Estate*, 154 Pa. St. 430, 26 Atl. 388. But where those in control of the majority vote are prevented by a fixed, predetermined restriction from using their discretion regarding so important a matter as the choice of directors, the minority stockholders may well complain. *Billings v. Marshall Furnace Co.*, 210 Mich. 1, 177 N. W. 222. See *Gage v. Fisher*, 5 N. D. 297, 307, 65 N. W. 809, 813; *Fennessy v. Ross*, 5 App. Div. 342, 346, 39 N. Y. Supp. 323, 325. This is particularly true in the principal case, since here the individuals designated by the will as directors are testamentary trustees, with perhaps no personal interest in the welfare of the corporation. See *Robotham v. Ins. Co.*, 64 N. J. Eq. 673, 702, 53 Atl. 842, 853. The undoubted jurisdiction of equity to relieve against the voting requirement if need arises may, however, be sufficient ground for supporting the decision. See *Pennington v. Metropolitan Museum*, 65 N. J. Eq. 11, 55 Atl. 468; *Johns v. Montgomery*, 265 Ill. 21, 106 N. E. 497.

**TRUSTS — FOLLOWING MISAPPROPRIATED PROPERTY — WHAT CONSTITUTES A PURCHASER FOR VALUE.** — A unlawfully obtained crossed checks payable to himself, drawn on the C Bank, which he deposited in the D Bank and which the D Bank collected. B was living with A as his mistress, and he gave her checks drawn on the D Bank, which she took in good faith. The E Bank collected for her and placed the amount to her credit. B's account still showed a balance in her favor when the C Bank brought suit, joining A, B, and the E Bank. The E Bank paid the money into court, and judgment was given for the plaintiff. B appealed. *Held*, that the appeal be dismissed. *Banque Belge pour L'Etranger v. Hambrouck*, [1921] 1 K. B. 321 (C. A.).

When a wrongfully acquired money *res* is mingled with other money, its substantial identity is not destroyed. *In re Hallet's Estate*, 13 Ch. D. 696; *Nat. Bank v. Ins. Co.*, 104 U. S. 54; *First Nat. Bank v. Hummel*, 14 Colo. 259, 23 Pac. 986. See Austin W. Scott, "The Right to Follow Money," 27 HARV. L. REV. 125. The former owner may claim either his *pro rata* share of the fund or a lien upon the whole fund. See James Barr Ames, "Following Misappropriated Property," 19 HARV. L. REV. 511; Austin W. Scott, "The Right to Follow Money," 27 HARV. L. REV. 125. And he may assert a lien against part of the fund which has been withdrawn, as long as it can be traced. *In re Oatway*, [1903] 2 Ch. 356. See SCOTT, CASES ON TRUSTS, 553 n; Austin W. Scott, *supra*, 27 HARV. L. REV. 125, 132. But his right of recovery is defeated if the *res* has come into the hands of a *bona fide* purchaser for value without notice. See James Barr Ames, *supra*, 19 HARV. L. REV. 511, 517. It is true in the present case that the E Bank, having given only a promise to pay to the depositor's order, was not such a purchaser. *Mann v. Second Nat. Bank*, 30 Kan. 412, 1 Pac. 579; *Batson v. Alexander City Bank*, 179 Ala. 490, 60 So. 313. See SCOTT, CASES ON TRUSTS, 655 n. But B was. Without notice she had given her body and her services, in return for title to the money. Is the defense of *bona fide* purchase to avail her nothing because she is guilty — not, under the laws of England, of a crime, but of conduct *contra bonos mores*? So, in effect, the court decides, by taking the title from B and giving it back to the C bank.